

REMARKS

Agent for Applicant presents original claims 2 and 6 and currently amended claims 1, 3-5 and 7-18 for reconsideration by the Examiner.

Claims 4, 5, 7-14 and 16-18

The Examiner stated that claims 4, 5, 7-14 and 16-18 are objected to for various informalities. Agent for Applicant has amended these claims to correct the dependencies of the claims, thereby correcting the antecedent problems identified by the Examiner.

Claim 15

The Examiner stated that claim 15 is rejected because the preamble states that only the enclosure system is being claimed while the positive limitations to the scaffold frame appears to be claiming a combination of the system and the scaffold frame, thus rendering the claim indefinite. In response, Agent for Applicant has amended the preamble of the claim so that it now refers to an enclosure system for scaffolding frame *having a first vertical member and a second vertical member*.

Claims 1-10, 15 and 17

The Examiner stated that claims 1-10, 15 and 17 are rejected as being unpatentable over Meier in view of Rushford or Brooks.

Meier teaches a device for scaffolding comprising a member (12) having hollow cylinders (13, 14) and slits (15, 16). However, as the Examiner duly recognizes, Meier does not disclose or suggest aligning members (12) in any fashion.

Rushford teaches a plurality of rails (4) that can be aligned to receive a cover sheet (50). Rushford can be distinguished from the present invention in that it does not disclose or suggest radially aligning members about a longitudinal axis. In other words, the rails (4) are not disposed about or connected to a longitudinal axis such that they achieve radial alignment.

Brooks teaches vertical straight frame sections (21) and curved frame sections (22) having grooves (30). In this case, the grooves (30) are not radially alignable with respect to a

longitudinal axis defined by the frame sections (21, 22) since the grooves (30) are integral to the frame sections (21, 22). This is made clear in Figs. 9 and 10. In other words, nowhere in Brooks is it disclosed or suggested to radially align grooves with respect to a longitudinal axis defined by an external frame.

In contrast, the present invention comprises stackable section members that are radially aligned about a longitudinal axis defined by the scaffolding frame. Independent claims 1 and 15 have been amended to include this limitation.

Lacking at least these claimed features, it cannot be said that the Meier and Rushford and Brooks, either alone or in combination, discloses the present invention as claimed.

Claims 13 and 16, 11 and 18, 12 and 14

The Examiner stated that claims 13 and 16, 11 and 18, 12 and 14 are rejected as being unpatentable over Meier in view of Rushford or Brooks, and further in view of Saulters, Mydans, Adolfson, Dotson and/or Muir.

Each of claims 13 and 16, 11 and 18, 12 and 14 depend from claim 1 or 15 and therefore contain all of the limitations of claims 1 or 15. Agent for Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1 and 15 are patentable over Meier in view of Rushford or Brooks, for reasons stated above. Therefore, claims 13 and 16, 11 and 18, 12 and 14 are also patentable over these references for at least these reasons.

CONCLUSIONS

Applicant respectfully states that this amended application is now in condition for immediate allowance and respectfully solicits same.

Yours faithfully,



Agent for Applicant
Eugene J.A. Gierczak
(Registration No. 31,690)
MILLER THOMSON LLP
Barristers & Solicitors
40 King Street West, Suite 5800
P.O. Box 1011
Toronto, Ontario, Canada M5H 3S1
Telephone No. 416.596.2132
Telecopier No. 416.595.8695

EJAG/MJG

N:\corp\legiercza\Stucco One\US\OA resp Jul 25 06.doc